

THE
New T E S T
OF THE
Church of England,
LOYALTY,
Examined by the
Old T E S T
OF
Truth and Honesty.

L O N D O N , Printed by R. G. 1687.

THE NEW TESTAMENT

OF THE

Design of the

NEW TESTAMENT

Exposition of the

NEW TESTAMENT

BY JESSE C. HARRIS

DOVER PUBLICATIONS

THE
NEW TEST
OF THE
Church of England's
LOYALTY, &c.

THE reason why the Church of *England* may above any ~~other~~ parastis from her appropriate to her self the Principles of true Loyalty, is so apparent from her constant Practice and Doctrin, that one would think this Scribler of *the New Test* never considered it at all (though he tells us he hath often consider'd, because he cannot find it. For I challenge him or any man to shew ~~the~~ any that are not of her Communion, (not excluding even *the Calver of the Hind*, the Sons of the Church of *Rome* it self,) that did constantly maintain the Doctrin of Non-resistance to the Supreme Magistrate and practise according to it; as our Church and her true Sons have always done. Was there ever any such Doctrin as the Deposing of Kings, the subjecting them to a foreign Bishop, or to an Assembly at Home, the making them Trustees of the People, or ascribing an Authority Co-ordinate to theirs in the Peoples Representatives, the Founding Dominion in Grace; or Lastly, owning a Power in the inferior Magistrates to Act without, or contrary to their Commission taught by our Loyal Mother; and have not some or all of these been taught by some of the other Parties? So that if they are Loyal it is no thanks to their Religion for it. Have not all the other Parties acted according

ding to these Antimonarchical principles ? Or can the worst of our Enemies with any truth accuse our Church or her true Followers of any such Actions ? But, what (saith this Test-maker) can be more ridiculous then for such, who cannot pretend to infallibility even in matters of Faith, to assume to themselves an inerrability in civil Obedience ? Oh profound Sense and Reason ! what cannot Men be Loyal, and Act according to their constant Principles of Loyalty without being infallible ? Or will not this Gentleman give us leave to be so kind to him, or any of the Members of the Church of *Rome*, as to think them indued with Loyalty without robbing their Holy Father the *Pope* of his Prerogative of Infallibility, and ascribing part to his Sons ? Did ever any Man of the Church of *England* assume to himself an inerrability in his Obedience ; only so long as he kept close to his Rule his Church hath given him ? I am sure on the contrary, the Sons of that Church that affirms to her self Infallibility in matters of Faith, can never be indued with that singular Gift of Loyalty, so long as they keep themselves out of the reach of the *Anathema* of their infallible Council of *Lateran*, affix'd by an inerrable Canon upon all such as deny the *Pope's* power to depose Heretical Princes or Favourers of Hereticks. So that I must needs own (if they are Loyal) their Loyalty far exceeds ours, since they are Loyal at the peril of their immortal Souls, whereas we can only venture our Temporal concerns for our Prince.

If therefore you will shew your selves truly Loyal, in the next Address renounce that disloyal Canon of the Council of *Lateran* ; or else we must believe either, that you are not Catholicks (as in your Religion, you love to be called) or else do but serve a turn in your Pretences of Loyalty.

Out of his abundant kindness to the Members of the Church of *England*, this Gentleman is pleased to allow them to have been Faithful and Serviceable to King Charles the First ; we are extremely obliged to him for this so favourable a Concession ; and indeed I could not but have some thoughts of presenting an Address of thanks to him for it : But that he hath saved me the trouble in so well explaining it. For he tells us, that this was only in our own defence, and not joyning with the common Enemy to cut our own Throats ; nay further, that the Ambition of our Church occasion'd the late War, and the loss of the King's Life and Crown. If so ; then our Church was

was serviceable to King Charles the First with a vengeance. This (me thinks) looks something like a Dear-joye's *Witticism*, or in plain English a down-right Bull, that we should be serviceable to our King, and yet, *occasion the loss of his Crown and Life* : But it is no matter what Contradictions he writes, if he can but thereby bespatter the Church of *England* ; he knows he is to deal with a People of an implicit Faith that can swallow any Contradictions, or false Stories. Did ever any Man thus out-face the Sun as he hath done in these Aspersions ? Do not all Men (that know any thing of the History of the late times) know that if we of the Church of *England* would have joyn'd with the Rebels, or, but have owned the Usurpers Authority, we might have enjoyed all our Rites, and have expected much greater Preferments ? Was not this then very like consulting our own present Interest to suffer Sequestrations, Decimations, Plunderings, Imprisonments ; nay Death it self, rather then Act against our Duty to our Prince ? Is it not as visible as the Sun, that the first pretence for the late War was for securing of Property, and that Religion was but made a stalking Horse to catch the Rabble ? How then was the *Ambition of our Church, the occasion of it* ? But, Oh the admirable Loyalty of the *Romanists*, *That served the King without any Prospect of advantage to themselves* ; Nay, when their Services were rejected by the King, and their Persons banished from his Presence ! Did not the Rebellious party cry out against Popery, and pretend that they only designed to secure the Nation against *Papists* ? they knew, or at least at first believed (as he saith) they should meet with no quarter from the Rebels, and therefore where should they fly for safety, to the Royal party ? but as soon as His Majesty was forced by his Parliament to discard them, and that they saw the other party would receive them, how many of them listed themselves under their Banners ? *And, All Men know the great numbers of Papists which Vid. the' serv in their (the Rebels) Army, Commanders and others* ; and hath not Works of K. Old Peter Du Moulin long since asserted, and offered to prove it by undoubted Evidence, that a *Jesuit* at the very execution of his late Majesty K. Charles the First, was seen amongst the Rebels *throming up his Cap for Joy* ; insulting in the most barbarous manner over that poor Prince in his last Tragick Exit ? So true is it, *That never any of that Communion served that Party*.

This infallible Author is resolved he will do the Church of *England's* business for Loyalty, and therefore he rakes up all the odious

Acts that ever have been done, since the *infancy* of our Church (as he words it, p. 4. *in fine*) and very obligingly fathers them upon her. Of all which the *Scotch Answer*, *viz.* *Bellarmino shewes* is a sufficient confutation.

For as for that, that *she* [the Church of *England*] *endeavoured with all her might to set up a Bras of her awn to exclude Queen Mary*. It is so void of all appearance of Truth, that it would puzzle any man by the History of those Times to gues what he means by it. I suppose he means the *Lady Jane Gray*. But was not she set up by the Ambition of *Dudley D. of Northumberland*, who thereby hoped to have raised his Family [his Son being her Husband] to the Royal Dignity? Did not the Members of the Church of *England*, who were then in *Power* joyn against him? Nay did not *Northumberland* himself after he was taken [so true a Son of our Church he was] offer to embrace the Communion of the Church of *Rome* to save his Life? Was it not easy for the *Protestants* at that time to have set up her Sister *Elizabeth*, whom they knew to be of their own Religion, and to have excluded *Queen Mary*; but so far were they from opposing the right Succession, that upon her Arrival into *Framingham-Castle*, they readily joyned with her, and set her upon her Throne.

But after *Queen Mary's Death*, (saith he *ibid.*) *Elizabeth a known Bastard raised the Church of England as a Prop to support the Weakness of her Title*. Is not this said like a true Loyal Jesuit, shewing the Honour he hath for Crown'd Heads, by fixing upon one of the most renoun'd of them, the most Honourable Title of a plain, downright Bastard? Nay, it is by so much more like him, by how much it wants of Truth. Was not Queen *Elizabeth* Daughter of King *Henry the Eighth* born in Wedlock after a most solemn Divorce, grounded upon one of the justest Causes that could be, *viz.* The Nullity of his former Marriage with the Lady *Katherine of Spain*? Was not it thought at first so by Cardinal *Wolsey*, nay, by the Pope himself, who had he not been overaw'd by the Emperour, would have determined the Marriage unlawful, nay, did not he sign a Bull to that purpose? I dare appeal to this Gentleman himself, whether there be not far more Reason to believe it unlawful for a Man to Marry his Brother's Wife, than there is to think it Lawful? Now if this Question must be determined in the Affirmative, doth it not directly follow that *Queen Mary's Legitimacy* was far more uncertain, and consequently her Title did more

more need *a Prop. to support the Weaknes of it*, than her Sister Queen Elizabeth's? Henry the Eighth their Father knew this well enough, and therefore settled the matter (as well as he could) by Acts of Parliament; which right I shall not dispute. But however if the Romanists thought it good against the Scotch title for Queen Mary, why might not the Protestants think it as good for Queen Elizabeth? *But they (saith he) no sooner found themselves so established, then they fell to making those Canibal-Laws to Hang, Draw, and Quarter the Priests of the Living God, &c.* Not so fast, I beseech you Sir, were these Edicts made or consented to by the Convocation? were these ever made Canons of our Church? Why then is not the Saddle set upon the right Horse, and they own'd to be the acts of State, and not of our Church? Again, how can these be said to be true *Priests of the Living God*, who would not own the Power that God had set over us in our Nation, but look'd upon the supreme Magistrate, as one depos'd by the Popes Authority, and adjudged to Death, and therefore were continually Plotting and Contriving against her Life and Dignity, and setting up the Queen of *Scots* Title against her, which forced the Queen and her Council (which had it not been necessary, I am sure the Members of our Church would have thought most inhumane) to take away the Life of that unfortunate Princess? Now I pray what Crime is it, or what fault is it in our Church, if the Supreme Power of our Nation does enact Laws to secure the Government? Or what disloyalty is it for the Church of *England* not to join with Rebels, or for the State to punish them by Law?

Oh! but *these Laws are exclaim'd against by all the Reformed Churches of Christendom, &c.* (p. 5.) But for this we must only take this Gentleman's bare word; of the Sincerity of which, this Pamphlet hath already given us such undoubted Instances as can not but prevail with us, if we resolve never to be believ'd our selves, to believe him; but supposing any of the Reformed should speak against them, have not our Governours the Power of determining by Law what is necessary for the publick Peace?

But however who can endure to hear Papists crying up Moderation, and exclaiming against Sanguinary Laws, &c. For, this is for the Kettle to accuse the Pot of Blackness. Who I pray first enacted that *Act, De Heretico Comburendo*, and as long as they had Power, nay sometimes, (as in the Case of *John Husse*, &c.)

contrary

contrary to the most solemn Promise of an whole Council of their Clergy put it in Execution ?

Who was it that found out that old meek Method of converting Hereticks by the *Inquisition* ? or that more Harmles way (now so much celebrated by the French Clergy) of perswading them by *Booted Apostles*, who will neither let them *Fly*, nor *Dye*, nor Sleep, nor Eat in quiet, till they have own'd their Conversion ?

Who was it that Murthered such numbers of the *Albigenses* in cold Blood, in the days of *Yore*, and in latter times butchered so many Thousands of the *English* in *Ireland*, and since that put to the Sword so many Protestants about *Piedmont* ?

Who was it that murthered two Princes one after another, *viz.* *Henry the 3d.* and *Henry the 4th.* of *France*, and raised that Bloody League, called the Holy League (a pattern to our Protestant-Jesuists-Scotc-Covenant) by which so many Thousands were destroyed by War ? Who was it that approved these things, and made Panegyrick Orations upon them ? Were these Members of the Church of *England*, or of the Church of *Rome* ? I leave it to this Gentleman to tell us in his next Pamphlet, if he desires to hear any more of these matters : and shall conclude this affair with an Expression of his own rightly applied, *viz.* *That if Murtherers of their Lawful Sovereigns ; if making holy Leagues against them ; if raising Wars and Commotions in all Kingdoms ; and Canons of Infallable General Councils that bind them to such Actions under an Anathema be sufficient Testimonies of Loyalty, we must own the Church of Rome to have been hitherto unparalleled in her Duty, but if this be not the true Test of Loyal Subjects, our Rock of Loyalty is already degenerate into a Rock of Scandal, of Disobedience, and Rebellion.* p. 5, in fine & p. 6.

The rest of his Discourse from p. 6. line the 7th. is taken up in base and false Insinuations of the *Church of England's* *Disloyalty*, or at least *Ingratitude* to our present King, in that notwithstanding his Gracious Promises and Royal Word to maintain our Religion, we dare not trust him, nor had not so much Gratitude to take off the *Sanguinary Laws* and the *Test* at his request.

But (Good Sir) if our *Parliament* of *England* will not do this, what is it to the *Church of England*? Why must the Church answer for the Acts of the State? or why is it *Ingratitude* or *Disloyalty* to secure our selves against *Popish Priests* who hold

there

there is no Falsh to be kept with us, and teach this Doctrine to all sorts of Persons? Why (I pray you) is it not more Ingratitude and Disloyalty in the Church of *Rome*, to a Prince that hath been so prodigiously kind to her, to venture theſe Kingdoms for her ſake, not to take off that *Bull* that hinders them from Communicating with the Church of *England*; and *Pius Quarius* his *Creed*, and the Injunction of Subſcribing to it, which would go very far in Uniting the two Churches? If this be not ingratitude in her ſtill to keep her Poſt, why is it in the Church of *England* to do the ſame? Let us ſee the Pope and Clergy of *Rome* ſet us this Example of Gratitude, and this may be a great inducement to our Church and Nation to follow it. Suppose a Man hath good flights of Pidgeons in his Dove-house, and loves them well, and therefore hath provided ſuch a Trap as he hath experienced does keep out the Vermin, that otherwife would creep in and deſtroy his Pidgeons, would you not think him a Mad man, or else very willing to ſuffer his innocent Doves to be utterly deſtroyed that ſhould take away his Trap, and thereby give leave to all the devouring *Wengles*, *Poccau*, *Hawk*, *Owles*, *Buzzards*, and *Carrion-crows* to come in amongſt them and not only diſturb, but deſtroy them at their pleasure?

If the *Tate* be ſo Ungrateful and Disloyal a thing to our Church, why is not the *Tate* in *France* (which was a Pattern to ours, nay, doth far exceed it, for the Right Heir to the Crown is excluded there without taking it) a greater sign of Ingratitude and Disloyalty in the Church of *Rome*?

But this *Tate* was contriv'd by *Shafſbury* and deſign'd againſt the King himſelf. (ibid. p. 6.).

Was it ſo? why then do you throw it upon the Church of *England*? is the Church of *England* to anſwer for *Shafſbury*'s invenſions who was her greatest Enemy? but however (to give the Devil his due) how can this *Tate* be deſign'd againſt the King, when the Royal Family are particularly exempted from taking it; which was on purpose ſo contriv'd by the Loyal Churchmen in the Parliament to ſecure the Succession in a right Line?

But the House of Commons made an Addiſion to his Majefty, that none ſhould be Engaged, who were not capacitated by the ſaid *Laws* and *Tate*, (i.e.) in ſhort; Your Majefty muſt have ſome either in the Army or in the Cauſe, but ſuch as really believe, and will ſwear to it, and to the Majefty; These are his words, ibid. p. 6.

Why in the first place, *such as will swear, &c.* The Oaths that are required by the *Test*, are only the Oaths of *Supremacy* and *Allegiance*. Now why any should be trusted with the Power of the Nation, who will not swear Fealty to the Government, my dull Politicks I confess cannot understand. As for the renouncing of *Transubstantiation*, a bare Declaration and Subscription *without Swearing* is all that the *Test* it self doth command. But this it is for a Man to write (as he believes) by an implicit Faith (i.e.) to take things upon Trust without any Examination, and to set them down for Truths.

But suppose now the worst that can be, that it was Literally true as he would have it. What harm would it be to his *Majesty, to be served by none but such as believe, and will swear that he is an Idolater*; if they are all such (as the Sons of the Church of *England*) *who do believe and think themselves bound to serve him faithfully, though he really was not only an Idolater, but an Heathen?* Is he not far safer in such hands, than in the hands of such, who though they think him not an Idolater, yet if they think him an Heretick, or a favourer of Hereticks, may think themselves bound to destroy him; especially if a Foreign Power shall give them Authority, as too many Popes have done, even against those Princes that have professed the *Roman Religion*? Lastly, who is there of the Church of *England*, that because he himself doth not believe *Transubstantiation*, does therefore think that the King does not? or that will pronounce him an Idolater for Worshiping that which he believes is God?

Since then Slandering and Mis-representation will not do, the Gentleman proceeds in the next place (Pag. 7.) to *Whedding*; but the best on't is, he hath made a Rod for his own Britch, and his own Words reflect more upon his own Church than ours; for *is it not a delicate innocent Church, that cannot be safe but in a fortified place?* *It is a great Argument of her modesty, to own her self weak and unable to subsist without a Law to burn Hereticks*; or what is worse, to clap them up, and *stifle them, or starve them, or wrack them to death in the Inquisition*, who cannot conform to all their Superstitions. *Prayer, Fasting, Mortification of the Flesh, and other Austerities are not, it seems, so proper means to remove her Fears and Jealousies, but She must have a Coercive Power even over Kings themselves,* The Primitive Christians flourished for three hundred years under

under Persecution, but yet their number increased more in three years in Constantine's Reign, than almost in all the three hundred years before. If this Church be from God, it will stand; hath not the Apostolical Church, (nay, the only Catholick Church, as Rome stiles it self) the assistance of the Holy Ghost, who is to continue with the true Church till the end of the World? Why then doth not She, who pretends to be the Mother-Church, of all others, set her Children an Example in the discarding her Sanguinary Laws against all Hereticks, and granting a full Liberty of Conscience to all sorts of Men? If She would do this, by her Success therein, we should the better judge the Expediency of it for our selves; if She will not do this, and afford Protestants Places of Profit and Honour, why should we take off our Laws for their Sakes, who will abate nothing for ours.

Pag. 8. He acts the Divine, and would fain urge *Transubstantiation* for a probable Doctrine, because of the many Wise and Learned that believe it, or at least pretend to do so: By the same Argument he might as well prove Mahometism to be a probable Opinion; for there are many Wise Men, nay, some Learned men amongst the Turks as well as amongst the Papists. Whom he reflects upon by his new Tenet, which makes it Idolatry to adore the Divine Body of Christ; whether there be a Transubstantiation or not, I am not able to judge, for I assure him this is the first time I ever heard of this Opinion. It cannot be the Church of England's (nor the infallible Parliament's) as he calls it, for the Reason that is given by our Rubrick, is because the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural Substances, and therefore may not be adored, &c.

In the last Place, he proceeds to give us Advice, but the Advice of Enemies is always dangerous to be taken, and surely none more dangerous than this, viz. That the Loyal Church of England should change her old Principles of Loyalty, and learn of her Catholick Neighbours how to behave her self towards Princes. What Principles would he have us change, and for what? Would he have us renounce our constant Principle of Non-resistance to Princes, and change it for that of the deposing Doctrine? Would he have us learn of our Neighbour-catholicks how to make Holy Leagues against our King, and to murder our Royal Masters? but he proceeds.

Or She must give his Majesty leave not to nourish a Snake in his Bosome, but to withdraw his Protection from such as withdraw their Fidelity.

This

This part of his Advice we are ready to take, for we are not for restraining of Princes, nor would we desire him to *inurify Snakes in his own Bosome*, such *Rouliacks* and *Jagues Clemeus* (I mean) who carry a mortal Sting full of deadly Poyson against Princes, even in their very Principles, and have always shown it upon all opportunities in their Actions. Neither are we against his *misdrawing his Protection from such as cease to be Loyal*; nor are we for his protecting such as never were so, such as his Wife and Learned Grand-father, *James the First*, said, *were never to be abliged by Benefits*. May his Majesty find his new Friends and Converts, that he hath endeavour'd so highly to oblige by his Toleration, to be as True and Loyal to him as his old Friends of the Church of *England* are, and always were; and may God Almighty preserve him to protect all his Subjects, and then we shall not regard the grinning Threatnings, and snarling Insinuations of any scribbling Animals.

F I N I S.

